



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,034	12/14/2000	Werner Obrecht	MO5842/LEA 34092	4130
34947	7590	03/03/2011		
34947 LANXESS CORPORATION 111 RIDC PARK WEST DRIVE PITTSBURGH, PA 15275-1112			EXAMINER	
			SERGEANT, RABON A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipmail@lanxess.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/739,034	Applicant(s) OBRECHT ET AL.
	Examiner Rabon Sergeant	Art Unit 1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 20, 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8,9 and 23-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8,9 and 23-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/89/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) Other: _____

1. Claims 8 and 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have claimed a rubber vulcanate and have further claimed that the vulcanate is utilized in specified molded rubber bodies. Since statements of intended use do not carry patentable weight, it is unclear how the specified utilization serves to limit the claims.

Consonant with Office policy and absent further explanation, the examiner takes the position that the language pertaining to utilizing the vulcanate fails to carry patentable weight.

2. The examiner has considered applicants' response; however, it is unclear how the response has addressed the issue raised by the examiner. Despite applicants' response, the examiner sees no distinction between such language as "for use within" and the claimed language, "is utilized in".

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 8, 9, and 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obrecht et al. ('488) or DE 19701487, each in view of Dammann et al. ('531) or JP 57-212239 or JP 5-17630.

The primary references disclose rubber mixtures comprising double bond containing rubber and crosslinked rubber particles having applicants' claimed properties, wherein the mixtures are useful for producing vulcanisates and molded articles, such as those claimed. See abstract; column 1, lines 31+; columns 2 and 3; and column 4, lines 49-59 within Obrecht et al. See abstract and page 4, line 3 within DE 19701487. Though the primary references are silent regarding the addition of a polyisocyanate component to the composition, the use of polyisocyanates within rubber mixtures to improve physical properties was known at the time of invention. This position is supported by the teachings of the secondary references. The secondary references disclose that polyisocyanate containing rubber formulations display excellent moldability and bonding resistant to heat and humidity. See abstracts of secondary references.

5. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate polyisocyanates within the rubber mixtures of the primary references, so as to produce rubber compositions having the improved moldability and bonding characteristics taught by the secondary references. This position is bolstered by the fact that it has been held that it is *prima facie* obvious to utilize a known component for its art recognized purpose. *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356. *In re Dial et al.*, 140 USPQ 244.

6. Applicants have argued that the cited art does not encompass non-adhesive molded bodies and does not render the claimed invention obvious. Furthermore, applicants further state that the Board of Appeals appears to accept applicants' position regarding the non-obviousness nature of the invention. In response to this latter issue, it is not seen how applicants can take such a position. The Board of Appeals decision of March 30, 2010 specifically states at page 4 that the merits of the prior art rejection have not been reached. In response to the former issue, applicants' arguments in no way address the fact that the prior art specifically states that the compositions therein are used in the manufacture of moldings, including tires, shoe soles, conveyor belts, rollers, cable sheaths, sealing rings, damping elements, and drive belts. See abstract and page 14, lines 3-7 of the translation of DE 19701487. See abstract and column 5, lines 18-22 of Obrecht et al. Since the prior art compositions are suitable for the production of the same molded bodies as applicants' invention, it is not seen how applicants' arguments can distinguish the instant claims from the prior art. Applicants' arguments link the property of adhesion to the articles produced; therefore, since the prior art discloses the production of the same articles as those of applicants, it stands to reason, in light of applicants' arguments, that the prior art compositions must possess analogous adhesion properties compared to applicants' composition.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1765

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

/Rabon Sergent/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1765